



Contact: Ilene Berman, Program Director
Education Division
202/624-5378
November 14, 2008



Improving Charter School Leadership

Executive Summary

After the quality of a school's teachers, the quality of a school's leaders is the most influential school-based factor affecting student learning. Moreover, research has found that leadership impacts student achievement the most in academic settings serving students who traditionally have not done well in school.¹

In an effort to provide high-quality K-12 education options, particularly for the many students across the country who attend low-performing schools, governors and other state policymakers are looking to alternative approaches, such as charter schools, to maximize their investments in public education. Forty states and the District of Columbia have laws that allow for fiscally independent, tuition-free charter schools that operate under a performance contract. Today, more than 1.2 million students attend the more than 4,300 charter schools established since the first state charter law was adopted in 1991.

As the number of students attending charter schools continues to rise, state leaders have a growing interest in ensuring that this education sector is well-equipped to meet the goals of improving student achievement, especially for low-income and minority families who have been underserved by the traditional education system. Without strong leaders—namely school directors and members of the school's board of directors—charter schools will not be well-positioned to meet their promise of raising student achievement. Strong charter school leaders are necessary to establish and achieve a clear school mission; to recruit, develop, and retain effective educators; and to provide teachers the leadership support they need to deliver high-quality instruction.

Governors and policymakers interested in expanding and strengthening their states' charter school options will need to consider what policy levers to use to increase the supply and quality of charter school leaders. States can pursue the following strategies:

- Support new and existing university-based charter school leadership training programs and partnerships (e.g., Aspire Public Schools and San Jose State University's school directors training program partnership) and nontraditional providers (e.g., New Leaders for New Schools and Building Excellent Schools);
- Help secure funding for charter leadership programs by soliciting private support or using federal funding, such as the Voluntary Public School Choice Program;
- Enhance charter school directors' ability to hire qualified teachers by allowing charter schools or programs to run their own teacher training programs;
- Increase directors' ability to attract and retain effective staff by offering state benefits for charter school teachers;
- Provide ongoing and relevant professional development for school directors across the district and charter school sectors; and
- Encourage and support charter board member training.

Background

Charter school success is highly dependent on the expertise of school directors and charter school board members. They must operate and run their schools without the resources and expertise provided by personnel within the traditional school district structure (e.g., superintendent, local education agency office services and administration, and the local school board). Because charter schools are not subject to many of the regulations and requirements imposed on district public schools, states have an opportunity to exercise innovative approaches for recruiting, training, and retaining effective charter school leaders. Unlike district public schools, which report to a superintendent and a local school board, charter schools are charged to meet the goals of performance contracts approved by a charter school authorizer. Charter authorizers review and approve school applications for establishment and renewal. Although specifics vary by state, authorizers may be state or local boards of education, higher education institutions, special-purpose boards, or municipal bodies. Much attention has been given to the need to improve the authorizing function, but less attention has been paid to the need for and approaches to developing a new generation of effective charter principals and charter board members.²

Since their inception in 1991, the promise of charter schools has been that, in exchange for increased flexibility and autonomy, they would establish and deliver a high level of educational excellence. If a school did not achieve this, its authorizer would close the school. Examining the academic record across all charter schools shows that results are mixed.³ Many states have closed charter schools, often for financial mismanagement or failure to achieve their academic goals⁴. In 2006-07, for example, Arizona closed 10 schools, California closed 31, and Florida closed 14.

By the same token, the first 17 years of the charter movement also have yielded several school models producing excellent results. For example, **Colorado** identified two charter schools among the top 10 highest achieving schools in Denver that enroll a higher percentage of students of color than any of the other eight “distinguished” schools (56.4 percent and 92.9 percent, respectively).⁵ Amistad High School in New Haven, **Connecticut**, posted 2008 student achievement scores 21 points above the state average and more than 50 points above the district average.⁶ MATCH high school in Boston, **Massachusetts**, where more than 95 percent of students are either African American or Hispanic, posted state assessment scores that far exceeded the performance of white and Asian students in district public schools (94 percent of MATCH students were proficient in English, 93 percent were proficient in math).⁷

In a national comparison of student achievement in charter schools and district public schools, the average charter school had a “proficiency advantage” (the difference between the percentage of students who are proficient on state tests in charters vs. non-charters) of 4.2 percent in reading and 2.1 percent in math. Charter schools located in areas with a high percentage of African-American students had a proficiency advantage over the closest district public schools of 4.5 percent in reading and 2.6 percent in math.⁸

The Challenge of Ensuring Excellent Charter School Leadership into the Future

An effective charter school director and well-functioning board are key to delivering the educational results policymakers seek. A recent research summary found that a school’s leader was second only in importance to the school’s teaching staff in determining academic

achievement.⁹ In schools serving high percentages of students from low-income families, this research found, leadership is even more important. Many challenges, though, exist to establishing strong leadership for each public charter school.

Charter School Leadership Basics

Who governs charter schools?

Unlike district public schools that are centrally governed by the district board of education, most charter schools are governed by an independent board of directors. Charter school board members are typically drawn from the school's community, including parents, teachers, and people who possess skills and expertise that are of use to the school. Some states require parental involvement on the board,¹⁰ and some specifically stipulate inclusion—or exclusion—of teachers on the board.¹¹ Under state charter laws, it is the responsibility of the board to ensure that the school is successful and operates in compliance with applicable law and its charter agreement. Even where the school elects to hire an outside education management organization (EMO) or charter management organization (CMO) to operate the school, it is the board that retains ultimate responsibility and control.

Who provides day-to-day leadership for charter schools?

The autonomy of charter schools allows for creative models of leadership. In most instances, charter schools are led by a director or lead teacher. In most states, charter school leaders are not required to be licensed public school administrators, and many state laws do not stipulate licensure or training requirements for charter school leaders. Charter school directors are hired by the school's board of directors in most states. In some instances, school directors are hired by the authorizing school district or the EMO or CMO contracted to operate the school.

What are charter management organizations (CMO) and educational management organizations (EMO)?

Many charter schools opt to partner with an organization such as a CMO or an EMO that manages the school and provides educational and/or financial resources. Such partnerships provide those who seek to open a strong school the benefits of a district infrastructure in such areas as obtaining and dealing with a facility or contracting for various services including insurance, purchasing, and so on. CMOs are typically nonprofit organizations that rely on philanthropy to supplement the per pupil public funding that supports the school (e.g., ASPIRE Public Schools and Knowledge Is Power Program). EMOs are typically for-profit managers that occasionally look to capital markets to supplement the school's public funds (e.g., Edison Schools).¹² Both are organizations that operate networks of schools serving a specific geographic area, type of school, or educational mission. At their core, management organizations are designed to enable charter growth with consistent high quality. By centralizing or sharing key functions and resources across schools, CMOs and EMOs seek to offer greater efficiency and long-term sustainability for networks of charter schools.

Problems with Recruitment and Training of Charter School Directors and Board Members

When the charter movement began, leaders included many “renegade public school principals” and other educators who wanted to start schools that operated outside the

traditional school structures.¹³ As new charter schools open, and the pipeline of renegades taps out, charter schools often compete with district public schools for effective school principals.¹⁴ Thus, the challenge of finding, training, and keeping well-qualified leaders in the charter sector is significant.

Training charter school leaders can be an expensive and time-consuming endeavor. Costs are largely determined by the length and intensity of the program and vary dramatically among programs across the country. Further, true costs are difficult to ascertain because of the variation in the level of government subsidy, participant payments and tuition, and in-kind institutional contributions. Some charter leader training programs include full-time yearlong internships and can cost as much as \$250,000 per trainee (e.g., Building Excellent Schools). Other year-long programs are part-time, and educators enrolled in them continue to hold full-time teaching positions; these can cost between \$3,100 to \$6,600 per participant (e.g., Achievement First Leadership Fellows, Minnesota's Leadership Academy).

Leadership development also can entail tremendous personal sacrifice. For example, one nationally recognized leadership preparation program, Building Excellent Schools, requires participants to relocate to another city for a year or to be away from home for as many as 100 nights during a year-long training period. Organizations such as the Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP), Building Excellent Schools, and New Leaders for New Schools provide some training programs in many states, but most states lack a formal or systematic strategy to develop a talent pipeline or management system for the next generation of charter leaders. Further, there has been no comprehensive analysis of *which type* of training program or *how much* training yields the greatest leadership benefit for the cost.

Although a charter school's director is responsible for its day-to-day operations, a charter school's board of directors is ultimately accountable for its academic performance and operations. The best charter board includes people who not only are supportive of its mission and vision but who also bring a wide array of skills and knowledge, in areas such as finance, real estate, education and curriculum, and community. As the number of charter schools throughout the country continues to rise and more are established in the same geographic region, the schools will find themselves competing for board members.¹⁵ Participation on a charter school board is not a casual commitment. The job is multifaceted, and the stakes for success are high.

The Multiple Roles and Skills Required of Charter School Leaders Can Be Difficult to Master

State laws vary, but in many states, charter schools function as both local education agencies (LEAs) and nonprofit organizations. Finding people with the variety of skills and experience as well as the commitment to run or serve on the board of a charter school can be challenging. In terms of size, scale, and budget, charters typically rank on the low end of both the education and nonprofit sectors, yet they must meet the operating requirements of both. Consequently, just as CEOs of small nonprofits and small businesses must adjust their administrative practices to operate effectively with a manageable level of overhead, so too, charter school directors must responsibly manage administrative costs to meet the requirements of both an LEA and a nonprofit. This requires creativity, collaboration, and efficiency to deliver high quality instruction, offer staff competitive wages and benefits, and maintain the school's financial well-being.

The charter school director position was called a "high-wire job" in a recent study of charter school leaders.¹⁶ Unlike their district school counterparts, charter directors are not typically

supported by a district infrastructure. In addition to serving as instructional leaders of their schools, directors often must find school facilities, develop and monitor budgets and strategic plans, recruit board members, hire and train staff, recruit and orient families, and work with the governing board, local community, and authorizing board.

Directors of charter school startups have an even more challenging role. In many cases, charter directors also must serve as public information directors, working with a vast array of groups, ranging from funders to journalists, legislators, community leaders, and parents.¹⁷ Directors surveyed for a study of highly successful charter schools across the country reported that they could never have anticipated the sheer breadth of hard work that would be involved and how many decisions they would have to make to create the systems necessary to start a charter school.¹⁸ Traditional school leadership training programs are not designed to prepare charter leaders for the responsibilities that go beyond those of a district school principal.¹⁹

Unlike most public school districts, where a building principal has day-to-day responsibilities in the school but the superintendent is the primary conduit to the school board, a charter school director often does both. Therefore, a positive and close working relationship between the charter school director and the charter school board is crucial. This provides tremendous opportunities to ensure that a close alignment exists between the administrative decisions of running the school and the classroom realities of teaching and learning. If directors do not effectively manage this connection, their jobs become even more difficult.

Some Policies Limit the Hiring and Retention of Strong Charter Teachers and Leaders

Of all the factors that contribute to what students learn in school, classroom instruction has been found to have the greatest impact. As the National Teaching Commission noted in 2004, “If we cannot attract and retain … high-quality teachers, we simply will not succeed in providing young people with the education they need and deserve.”²⁰

To fulfill their promise of excellence, charter school leaders must have the necessary flexibility to recruit and hire high-quality teachers and educational professionals. However, some state policies such as those that govern hiring for charter schools and benefits available to teachers, can limit leaders’ effectiveness in developing and maintaining successful charter schools.

Charter leaders face both unique opportunities and challenges in hiring their teachers. In many states, charter schools enjoy increased freedom over who to hire and who to retain as teachers; the ability to select teachers with commitment to a common vision, mission, and philosophy without being constrained by seniority; and the ability to set salaries and working conditions based on the needs of students.²¹

Conversely, many charters are limited (by their size and financial capacity) in their ability to offer competitive benefits packages to employees. Although staff members in district schools have access to statewide pension and retirement offerings, this is not always the case in charter schools.

How Can States Improve Charter School Leadership?

A fundamental tenet of the charter movement has always been increased flexibility and autonomy from state and federal requirements and regulations. Still, states can pursue

multiple strategies to ensure that charter leaders have access to training, policy environment, and ongoing professional development opportunities. By doing so, state policymakers can help increase the supply of well-prepared charter directors and strengthen the quality of charter board leadership.

States can facilitate university partnerships for training charter school leaders, recognize nontraditional providers of administrative credentials, or base new state leadership training programs on proven approaches. Governors and other state leaders can help secure funding for such programs and make policy changes that minimize some of the charter leadership challenges, including allowing charter schools to run their own teacher-training programs and providing benefits such as pension participation for charter school staff. State leaders also may promote effective leadership by facilitating connections among school leaders to share best practices and can strengthen the quality of charter school governing boards by encouraging board member training.

Bolster leadership training models

In some states, efforts are already underway to augment or expand existing leadership development programs offered by university departments of education to better prepare a new generation of charter school leaders. These partnerships include a combination of classroom instruction and a hands-on, applied approach to learning leadership skills within the context of a K-12 school.

A new and innovative effort partners public schools in Houston, **Texas** (including charter networks YES Prep and Knowledge Is Power Program), with a program at Rice University to prepare a next generation of “education entrepreneurs” for Houston schools, particularly those with underserved populations. Rice University, which has no education school, will offer through its business school three academic tracks for aspiring school leaders to earn an MBA or a non-degree certificate in advanced management for education entrepreneurs.²²

Emerging leaders in Aspire Public Schools (Aspire), a nonprofit organization that operates public charter schools in **California**, can earn their state-approved administrative credentials and their master’s degree in educational administration. In partnership with San Jose State University, Aspire Public Schools developed a tailored course of instruction that specifically prepares interested Aspire teachers to become Aspire principals. The coursework is built around Aspire’s philosophy that principals are instructional leaders, school community leaders, and business executives in charge of their budget, facilities, human resources, and more. Program graduates receive credentials and master’s degrees from San Jose State. In 2007, 12 of Aspire’s 17 principals were “home grown.”²³ Through their public postsecondary institutions, state leaders can encourage and recognize partnerships to fill the need for more and well-trained charter school directors.

Some states have provided incentives for proven leadership training programs that are not linked to postsecondary institutions to work in their states and be recognized as providers of administrative certification. One such program, New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS), is a national school leadership training program with a mission to improve students’ academic achievement by recruiting, training, and placing talented principals in urban schools, many of which have been charter schools. **Louisiana**, **Maryland**, and **Wisconsin** have recognized NLNS as an institution that can confer administrative certification for program participants. Nationally, the program has trained more than 560 leaders since its founding in 2000. NLNS training requires aspiring principals to serve in a yearlong residency working alongside a mentor principal. Trainees complete summer coursework and four one-week-

long seminars; the rest of the program is entirely hands-on leadership development. By recognizing NLNS as an accepted program offering “alternative routes to licensure,” these states expand access to principal training beyond traditional higher education providers.

State policymakers could provide similar incentives to other training organizations and charter management organizations with a demonstrated positive track record. KIPP, for example, has set up its own training program for leaders of its schools. “We found that we simply had to create a new training program if we wanted to have the type of administrators our schools need,” explained Mike Feinberg, co-founder of KIPP. To found a new KIPP school, every prospective director must be accepted into and successfully complete either a one-year or two-year KIPP School Leadership Program. KIPP recently issued a report documenting its widespread success in more than 66 schools, serving more than 17,000 students in 20 states.²⁴

Another program from which state leaders may want to learn or adapt training practices is the Building Excellent Schools (BES) Fellowship, a yearlong, training program in overall charter school leadership. BES Fellows are carefully selected leaders-in-training interested in designing, founding and operating a Fellowship charter school. A Fellowship year generally entails 100 days of extensive training and visits to as many as 30 top-performing urban charter schools in the northeast United States. This is followed by an extended residency in a high-performing charter school and ongoing coaching by a charter school leader.²⁵ To date, 35 BES Fellows have founded charter schools in seven states. Of the eight BES Fellow-founded schools in **Massachusetts** opened before 2006, five outperformed their surrounding districts on every statewide assessment their students completed.²⁶ By allowing flexibility and autonomy for such programs, policymakers can, in exchange, require a rigorous level of accountability (e.g., goals for academic growth or postsecondary readiness of students in schools where trainees are placed). Over time, strict accountability measures will enable a long-term assessment to determine the most successful approaches to charter leadership development.

Help secure funding for charter leader development

Securing funding for innovative charter school leadership preparation programs is an ongoing challenge. Many initiatives currently rely on philanthropic resources, which is typically not a sustainable long-term strategy.²⁷ Governors can play a key role in securing funding for charter leadership development.

Minnesota’s Governor Tim Pawlenty has used state support to gain private funding for charter sector growth. During his 2006 State of the State address, the governor specifically invited KIPP to open a school in Minnesota and helped arrange for state startup funding that was subsequently matched at least four-fold by private-sector contributions. This funding was used, in part, to prepare KIPP school directors to open a school in Minnesota. Former **Louisiana** Governor Kathleen Blanco enabled a \$1 million appropriation to bring the New Leaders for New Schools leadership training program to the state, and this funding leveraged additional private sector funds to establish the program in Louisiana.

Policymakers also can facilitate partnerships between the charter school sector and the corporate sector to raise funding or in-kind support for training programs. **Minnesota**’s leadership academy for charter directors pairs trainees with corporate leader mentors who provide this yearlong service as an in-kind contribution to the academy. In addition to providing mentors, major national corporations also contribute human resource training and access to state-of-the-art training facilities to support the program.

Another approach governors and other state policymakers can pursue is using federal funding to support charter leadership development. **Minnesota** recently secured approval to use competitively awarded federal funds to establish its leadership program. This program is funded through Minnesota’s five-year Federal Voluntary Public School Choice Initiative. Charter school leadership preparation was included (and approved) for the first time ever in this federal grant review cycle, largely because of an alliance between state policymakers, the state education agency, and partners at the University of Minnesota Center for School Change who conceived the model. These partners collaborated on the design and submission of the proposal and continue to work together on developing the leadership academy.²⁸

Enhance charter school directors’ ability to hire qualified teachers

Charter school directors indicate that difficulty attracting high-quality staff is a major leadership and organizational challenge.²⁹ To address this challenge, some states have allowed charter schools and charter management organizations to develop and provide teacher training that leads to licensure. High Tech High in **California** is authorized to operate its own teacher-credentialing program. This program, operated in collaboration with the University of San Diego, allows High Tech High to hire, train, and certify faculty with deep content knowledge and relevant industry experience, especially in science and engineering.³⁰ Such programs allow charter leaders to hire teachers with requisite knowledge and skills as well as an understanding of the schools’ mission and approach.

In **New York**, the School of Education at Hunter College has partnered with three highly regarded charter school organizations (i.e., Achievement First, KIPP, and Uncommon Schools) to develop a new teacher training and credentialing program that joins theory and practice. This program has been approved by the Regents of the State of New York as an officially recognized pathway to teacher certification.³¹

Increase directors’ ability to attract and retain effective staff by offering benefits

Recognizing that limited employee benefit opportunities create a barrier for teacher recruitment, some states’ charter laws now provide that charter school employees may be eligible to participate in state-run pension plans. For example, in **Missouri**, all instructional staff employed by charter schools may participate in the state pension system. In **Michigan**, teachers employed by charter schools may participate. In **Florida**, employees of conversion charter schools (i.e., formerly a district public school) remain public employees with access to the Florida retirement system; likewise, if the Florida charter school is operated by a municipality, the staff are eligible for state benefits. This, however, is not the case if the charter school is operated as a nonprofit organization (employees in these schools may not access the state benefit plan). In **Georgia**, Governor Sonny Perdue signed a state law in 2008 to allow charter employees to opt into the state benefit plan. Although charter school staff will now have this access, they are not considered state employees.³²

Help school directors to share leadership practices

Excellent leaders do not thrive in isolation. Effective school directors must be connected to other strong leaders to continue to build their professional skills and maintain passion for their work. States can help foster connections among leaders and strengthen ongoing professional development by encouraging existing state departments of education to partner with networks and charter associations to provide ongoing training opportunities around common issues. Policymakers can be instrumental in leveraging existing resources (e.g.,

statewide technology systems, data systems and communication networks, regional expertise) to provide opportunities for knowledge sharing across leaders in the district and charter sectors.

Several statewide charter associations, including those in **Arizona**, **Colorado**, and **Michigan**, work in cooperation with the state departments of education to provide ongoing professional development opportunities to charter school directors, curriculum specialists, and financial officers. **Michigan**'s charter school association regularly brings charter school professionals together regionally through its leadership roundtable program.³³ **Arizona** offers financial leadership workshops for school leaders, financial managers, and charter school board members.³⁴ The **Colorado** League of Charter Schools hosts a monthly three-hour leaders' breakfast and professional conversation to facilitate sharing of best practices across the district and charter school sectors.³⁵

Strengthen charter board leadership through training requirements

Charter school leadership comes from both the school directors and the school board of directors. To ensure that board members are prepared for the task, states can provide and support training and policies that position the school's board of directors to meet the promises of the school's charter.³⁶

Florida is the only state with a law that requires school board member training, but several states, including **Minnesota** and **New Jersey**, have state department of education regulations for board member training. The Florida charter school law mandates that governing board members receive training within 90 days of a charter being approved. Minnesota requires a day-long training program for at least the board chair and two other members of the board of newly chartered schools prior to disseminating startup funds. New Jersey's state department of education requires charter school governing board members to undergo annual training.

Although the specific training content varies from state to state, board members need two complementary types of knowledge and skills: school management and policy (e.g., conflict of interest, fiduciary responsibilities) and the so-called soft skills (e.g., strategic planning, relationship building, maintaining focus on vision and goals).³⁷

Florida law specifies training must include governance best practices, public record and open meeting requirements, as well as familiarization with state statute requirements and state board of education rules (e.g., accounting, insurance coverage, facilities requirements, attendance reporting). **Minnesota**'s training protocol covers best practices in charter leadership and provides board members with a broad overview of roles and responsibilities. New York City has developed a charter schools governance and board development guidebook that provides a recommended agenda for board member training. The guidebook also includes a comprehensive governance self-assessment for boards to use.³⁸

Some states encourage training and support tailored to the specific needs of individual charter school boards. The **Colorado** department of education endorses and encourages participation in the League of Charter Schools board governance training packages. The league offers training on topics including best practices in charter school governance, policy development and review, accountability and goal setting, and strategic planning.³⁹ The **Idaho** charter school network provides individual training sessions based on four “areas of excellence” developed by members of the network in collaboration with the Colorado League of Charter Schools—governance and administration, quality of academic program,

stakeholder satisfaction, involvement and support, and continuous school improvement plans. Idaho charter schools that are members of the network can request an assessment of their board. The assessment team, comprising volunteers from charter schools around the state, conducts interviews and makes observations related to the areas of excellence and prepares a final evaluation with recommendations for the individual school.⁴⁰

States can support such training by raising funds from the charter schools or providing resources through the state department of education. In **Michigan**, the law allows authorizers to charge an oversight fee of three percent of their schools' operating budget. This fee is used, in part, to train board members and staff and to provide technical assistance to their schools. Authorizers in the state support their schools through training programs offered directly through the authorizer staff, national organizations, and in-state sources, such as the National Charter Schools Institute and the state's charter association. **North Carolina**'s state department of education charter school office employs full-time staff responsible for taking requests for technical support from schools and matching schools with the appropriate resources.⁴¹

Conclusion

Over the past decade and a half, states have made strides in establishing new education options geared to meet state goals of raising academic performance. For the initial promise of charter schools to be realized, new and existing schools will require effective leadership from school directors and board members. Governors and other state policymakers are well-positioned to take steps that help to increase the pool and quality of the next generation of charter school leadership and call for evaluations of new state approaches for strengthening charter leadership.

This brief was authored by Laura Bloomberg and Joe Nathan of the Center for School Change at the University of Minnesota and Ilene Berman of the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. Priscilla Wohlstetter and Joanna Smith of the University of Southern California's Center on Educational Governance contributed helpful data and analysis to the brief, drawn from their work conducted for the National Resource Center on Charter Finance and Governance, under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education (Grant No. U282N060012).

The contents of this issue brief were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education (U282N060002). However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

Endnotes

¹ Kenneth Leithwood, Karen Seashore Louis, Stephen Anderson, and Kyla Wahlstrom, *How Leadership Influences Student Learning* (New York, NY: Wallace Foundation, 2005).

² Marci Cornell-Feist, *Steering the Course for Success: Authorizers and Effective Charter School Governance* (Chicago, IL: The National Association of Charter School Authorizers, Issue Brief #9, 2005).

³ National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, *Charter School Achievement: What We Know* (Washington, DC: July, 2005).

⁴ Todd Ziebarth, Mary Beth Celio, Robin Lake, and Lydia Rainey, “The Charter Schools Landscape in 2005” in *Hopes, Fears, and Reality: A Balanced Look at American Charter Schools in 2005*, ed. Robin Lake (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2005).

⁵ Denver Public Schools, available at: <<http://www.dpsk12.org>>.

⁶ Melissa Bailey, “Charter, City Schools Improve on Test,” *New Haven Independent* (New Haven, CT, July 16, 2008).

⁷ Match Charter Public School, available at: <<http://www.matchschool.org>>.

⁸ National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, *The Color of Success: Black Student Achievement in Public Charter Schools* (Washington, DC, June, 2008).

⁹ Leithwood et al.

¹⁰ For example, the Connecticut charter school law specifies, “The application shall include information concerning the charter school that describes . . . parental involvement in the operation and decision of the governing board.”

¹¹ Joanna Smith, Priscilla Wohlstetter, and Dominic Brewer, “Under New Management: Are Charter Schools Making the Most of New Governance Options?” in *Hopes, Fears, and Reality: A Balanced Look at American Charter Schools in 2007*, ed. Robin Lake (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2007).

“Some states require teacher representatives on the school’s governing board. For example, Minnesota’s charter law requires licensed teachers to constitute a majority of the school board by the end of the third year of operation . . . On the other hand, some states restrict teachers from serving on the school’s governing board, citing a potential conflict of interest in having teachers set policy that affects the conditions of their own employment. In a few states, the legality of teachers serving on charter school boards is being challenged in the courts” (22).

¹² Paul O’Neill, *Charter School Law Deskbook* (Charlottesville, VA: Lexis Nexis, 2007).

¹³ Christine Campbell, “Building a Pipeline of New School Leaders,” in *Hopes, Fears, and Reality: A Balanced Look at American Charter Schools in 2007*, ed. Robin Lake (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2007).

¹⁴ Betheny Gross and Kristen Martens, *Leadership to Date, Leadership Tomorrow: A Review of Data on Charter School Directors* (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2007).

¹⁵ Society for Nonprofit Organizations, *Board Member Shortage Spotlighted* (Canton, MI: Nonprofit World, December, 2002).

¹⁶ Christine Campbell and Betheny Gross, *Working without a Safety Net: How Charter School Leaders Can Best Survive on the High Wire* (Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2008).

¹⁷ Gross and Martens.

¹⁸ United States Department of Education, *Innovations in Education: Successful Charter Schools* (Washington, DC: Office of Innovation and Improvement, 2004), available at: <www.edpubs.org>.

¹⁹ Frederick Hess and Andrew Kelly, *Learning to Lead? What Gets Taught in Principal Preparation Programs* (Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute, 2005), available at: <http://media.hoover.org/documents/ednext20053unabridged_hess.pdf>.

²⁰ Leithwood, et al.

²¹ United States Department of Education, *Innovations in Education: Successful Charter Schools*. Although charter schools must be in compliance with federal education law, including the highly qualified educator components of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), some exceptions are made for teacher qualifications. If a state's charter law allows teachers in charter schools to be uncertified, NCLB does not require more. If a state's charter law allows only a certain percentage of those teachers to be uncertified, then that is the applicable standard under NCLB.

²² Jay Mathews, "Rethinking Principal Priorities of Training," *Washington Post*, January 21, 2008, Metro Section.

²³ Aspire Public Schools, *Home Grown Principals* (Oakland, CA: Aspire Public Schools, Fall 2006), available at: <<http://www.aspirepublicschools.org>>.

²⁴ KIPP 2007 Annual Report Card, available at: <<http://www.kipp.org/01/reportcard.cfm>>.

²⁵ The Building Excellent Schools Fellowship Model, available at: <<http://www.buildingexcellentschools.org/sp.cfm?pageid=1003#t>>.

²⁶ Building Excellent Schools, *2005-2006 Fellow Founded School Performance Report* (Boston, MA), available at: <<http://www.buildingexcellentschools.org>>.

²⁷ United States Department of Education, *Innovations in Education: Successful Charter Schools* (Washington, DC: Office of Innovation and Improvement, June 2004).

²⁸ United States Department of Education, Voluntary Public School Choice Program; CFDA 84.361.

²⁹ Campbell and Gross.

³⁰ High Tech High, *Teacher Credentialing* (San Diego, CA), available at: <http://www.hightechhigh.org/about/educator_training.php>; Center on Educational Governance, *Implementing an In-House Approach to Teacher Training and Professional Development* (Los Angeles, CA: National Resource Center on Charter School Finance and Governance, 2008).

³¹ Bess Keller, "College and Charter Groups Team Up to Train Teachers," *Education Week*, February 6, 2008.

³² Georgia's House Bill 1277 provides charter school teachers and other personnel access to the State Health Benefit Plan.

³³ Michigan Association of Public School Academies, *2008 Leadership Roundtable* (Lansing, MI), available at: <<http://www.charterschools.org/pages/2008leadershiproundtable.cfm>>.

³⁴ Arizona Charter Schools Association, “Member Benefits” (Phoenix, AZ), available at: <<http://www.azcharters.org>>.

³⁵ Colorado League of Charter Schools, “Professional Services Offered” (Denver, CO), available at: <http://www.coloradoleague.org/professional_services_governance.html>.

³⁶ For more detail about laws, policies, and programs states use to support charter boards, see Elizabeth Butler, Joanna Smith, and Priscilla Wohlstetter, *Creating and Sustaining High-Quality Charter School Governing Boards* (Washington, DC: National Resource Center on Charter School Finance and Governance, 2008).

³⁷ New York City Center for Charter School Excellence, “NYC Charter Schools Governance and Board Development Guidebook” (New York, NY: 2006), available at: <http://www.nycchartercenter.org/governance_guidebook.pdf>.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Colorado League of Charter Schools.

⁴⁰ Center on Educational Governance, *Developing Training Programs for Charter School Governing Board Members* (Los Angeles, CA: National Resource Center on Charter School Finance and Governance, 2007).

⁴¹ Butler, et al.